arXiv:1607.00838v1 [hep-ph] 4 Jul 2016

July 4th 2016

NON-VANISHING AT $m \to 0$ OF THE 1-LOOP SELF-MASS OF AN ELECTRON OF MASS m PROPAGATING IN A GRAPHENE-LIKE MEDIUM IN A CONSTANT EXTERNAL MAGNETIC FIELD

B. Machet [1] [2] [3] [4]

Abstract: The 1-loop self-energy of a Dirac electron of mass m propagating in a thin medium simulating graphene in an external magnetic field B is investigated in Quantum Field Theory. Equivalence is shown with the so-called reduced QED$_{3+1}$ on a 2-brane. Schwinger-like methods are used to calculate the self-mass δm_{LLL} of the electron when it lies in the lowest Landau level. Unlike in standard QED$_{3+1}$, it does not vanish at the limit $m \to 0$: $\delta m_{LLL} \stackrel{m\to 0}{\to} \frac{\alpha}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar\,|e|B}{c^2}}$ (with $\alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\hbar c}$); all Landau levels of the virtual electron are taken into account and on mass-shell renormalization conditions are implemented. Restricting to the sole lowest Landau level of the virtual electron is explicitly shown to be inadequate. Resummations at higher orders lie beyond the scope of this work.

PACS: 12.15.Lk, 12.20.Ds, 75.70.Ak

[1] Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, UMR 7589, LPTHE, F-75005, Paris, France
[2] CNRS, UMR 7589, LPTHE, F-75005, Paris, France.
[3] Postal address: LPTHE tour 13-14, 4ème étage, UPMC Univ Paris 06, BP 126, 4 place Jussieu, F-75252 Paris Cedex 05 (France)
[4] machet@lpthe.jussieu.fr

1 Introduction

The calculation of the 1-loop self-energy of an electron propagating in an external constant and uniform magnetic field B that I present here uses the sole techniques of Quantum Field Theory. The external electron is chosen, for the sake of simplicity, to lie in the lowest Landau level (LLL), and, in this case, analytical (quasi-)exact formulæ can be obtained by using the formalism of Schwinger [1] as it is carefully explained in [2].

I previously tackled the case of standard QED$_{3+1}$ in [3] by calculating the integral of Demeur [4] and Jancovici [5] beyond the leading $\left(\ln \frac{|e|B}{m^2}\right)^2$ approximation. I demonstrated that large logarithms had been overlooked and, then, neglected; they are tightly connected with the counterterms needed to implement suitable renormalization conditions. In this case, $\delta m \to 0$ when $m \to 0$.

These calculations are adapted here to a model which can naively mimic graphene in an external B. They are explained step by step such that they should appear fairly easy to reproduce, with no obscure gap to fill. They mostly go along the lines of [2], and differences are outlined. A massive Dirac electron is considered to propagate inside a thin film of thickness $2a$, the Hamiltonian of which being deprived of its "$p_3\gamma_3$" term (see for example [6]). B, supposed to be static and uniform is considered to be directed along the z axis orthogonal to the medium strip. To make the calculation simpler and more transparent, no Fermi velocity different from the speed of light is introduced, such that I will be dealing with a special avatar of Quantum Electrodynamics, and extra degeneracies present in graphene [6] are eluded. The topic of symmetries will not be dwelt on either (see the review [11] on this subject).

As I will demonstrate by working in position space, this model yields for the electron self-energy the same expression as reduced QED$_{3+1}$ on a 2-brane [7] [8]: the effective photon propagator turns out, indeed, to be the one of standard QED$_{3+1}$ integrated over its k_3 momentum. For the internal electron propagator in presence of an external B I use Schwinger's [9] and Tsai's [10] expression, which accounts for all Landau levels, adapted to the particular situation and Hamiltonian under consideration. The calculations are (and should) be performed with a non-vanishing electron mass m before the limit $m \to 0$ is taken. In the last part I only take into account the LLL of the internal electron, and show that neglecting higher levels is a bad approximation.

To avoid confusion, let me stress that all spinors and γ matrices that are considered in this work are 4-dimensional. Any eventual connection with QED$_{2+1}$, if any, can accordingly only be quite remote, and we shall not dwell on this any more.

While it is generally admitted that an external magnetic field is likely to trigger chiral symmetry breaking (see for example [11]), the demonstrations usually rely on various approximations. In standard QED$_{3+1}$, they are often based on the dimensional reduction that operates in the presence of a strong B [12] [13] and on resummations of a certain class of diagrams [14] [15] (which become suspicious after realizing that only double logs have been taken into account, leaving aside large single logs [3]). Also, various approximations to coupled Dyson-Schwinger equations are invoked, associated to the use of very special gauges to simplify the vertex (see [16]); this makes the demonstrations tedious, not very transparent and possibly controversial. In reduced QED$_{3+1}$ on a 2-brane, which is often considered to provide a fair description of graphene, other approximations are invoked, like the dominance of the lowest Landau level [17] while it was shown, for example in [15], that higher levels are important and trigger charge renormalization; moreover the language that is used is often confusing for people working in Quantum Field Theory.

So, though the result that I exhibit will certainly not be a surprise for many, I hope that the rigorous demonstration of a simple and exact formula that anyone can check with standard techniques will bring B-triggered mass generation from radiative corrections on a more solid ground. Like for QED$_{3+1}$, renormalization conditions and the counterterms that must be introduced to fulfill them play important roles [5].

[5] In a forthcoming work I will emphasize their role in the calculation of the photon vacuum polarization for the same graphene-like medium as

A major challenge is also, there, to deal with a strongly coupled theory since a 1-loop result is certainly meaningless when the coupling constant gets of order 1. The necessary resummations look highly non-trivial since they do not only concern double and / or simple logs, but more complicated functions, and they have furthermore, of course, to be performed while satisfying at each order appropriate renormalization conditions. To my knowledge this last requirement has never been satisfied and tackling such formidable tasks lies largely beyond the scope of this work.

2 Conventions and notations

We use the metric $(-\ +\ +\ +)$ like in [1], [10] and [2].

To avoid confusion, the unit of electric charge will be noted $|e|$ such that the electron charge is $-|e|$. In [1] and in [10], this unit of electric charge is instead noted e. In [2], e denotes instead the (negative) electron charge. We shall see that these precisions are important, in particular to get the appropriate propagator for the LLL of an electron.

Like in [1] and [10] we shall introduce q such that $q|e|$ is the electron charge. Therefore $q = -1$.

The conventions for γ matrices and Pauli $\vec{\sigma}$ matrices are the same as in [10], [2] and [1]. In particular, $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = -2g^{\mu\nu}$. We shall denote (abusively) $\sigma^3 \equiv \sigma^{12} = \frac{1}{2}[\gamma^1, \gamma^2] = diag(1, -1, 1, -1)$; it should not be mistaken for the corresponding 2×2 Pauli matrix.

The covariant derivative is $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i|e|qA_\mu$ such that $\pi_\mu = \frac{1}{i}\partial_\mu = p_\mu + |e|A_\mu$.

With these conventions, for an external magnetic field B along the z axis, the wave function of the lowest Landau level $|LLL>$ is proportional to $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ([19] [20]) such that $\sigma^3|LLL> = (-1)|LLL>$ and $(1 - i\gamma^1\gamma^2)|LLL> \equiv (1 - \sigma^3)|LLL> = 2|LLL>$.

For any 4-vector $v = (v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3)$, it is useful to introduce the notations $\hat{v} = (v_0, v_1, v_2, 0)$, $v_\parallel = (v_0, 0, 0, v_3)$ and $v_\perp = (0, v_1, v_2, 0)$.

3 Propagation inside a thin, graphene-like medium; equivalence with reduced QED$_{3+1}$ on a 2-brane

A general argumentation concerning reduced QED can be found, for example, in [7]. A more down-to-earth determination of the effective photon propagator is nevertheless instructive because it provides a simpler understanding of the mechanisms at work, and also because this approach can be applied to vacuum polarization [18], yielding less-trivial results.

Let us calculate in position space the electron propagator $G(y, x)$ at 1-loop depicted in Fig. 1 (including external legs). We call G_0 the tree-level electron propagator in the presence of B [6] (described by the double lines in Fig. 1) and $\Delta_{\mu\nu}$ the bare photon propagator.

the one considered here [18].

[6] The results of this paragraph do not depend whether the external B is present or not.



Fig. 1: the 1-loop electron propagator in external B

One has

$$G(x',x'') \equiv i < 0 \mid T\ \psi(x')\bar{\psi}(x'') \mid 0 >= \Phi(x',x'') \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ip(x''-x')} G(p) \tag{1}$$

in which the phase [10]

$$\Phi(x',x'') = e^{i|e|q\int_{x''}^{x'} dx_\mu A^\mu(x)} \tag{2}$$

ensures gauge invariance (A^μ is the vector potential).

The 1-loop electron propagator depicted in Fig. 1 writes

$$\begin{aligned} iG(y,x) = -e^2 \int d^4u \int d^4v\ e^{i|e|q\int_u^x dt_1^\mu A_\mu(t_1)} \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ip(u-x)}\ iG_0(p)\ e^{i|e|q\int_v^u dt_2^\mu A_\mu(t_2)} \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{iq(v-u)}\ iG_0(q) \\ \gamma^\mu \int \frac{d^4r}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ir(v-u)}\ i\Delta_{\mu\nu}(r)\gamma^\nu\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^v dt_3^\mu A_\mu(t_3)} \int \frac{d^4s}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{is(y-v)}\ iG_0(s) \\ = -e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} \int d^4u \int d^4v\ \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ip(u-x)}\ G_0(p) \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{iq(v-u)}\ G_0(q) \\ \gamma^\mu \int \frac{d^4r}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ir(v-u)}\ \Delta_{\mu\nu}(r)\gamma^\nu \int \frac{d^4s}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{is(y-v)}\ G_0(s). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We now specialize to the medium under concern and consider "graphene-like" electrons propagating inside a thin film of thickness $2a$. This situation has two consequences:

* $G_0(q) = G_0(\hat{q}), \quad G_0(p) = G_0(\hat{p}), \quad G_0(s) = G_0(\hat{s})$ get deprived of their γ_3 components;

* the vertices at which the electron and photon interact being located inside the strip, the integrals on their positions u_3 and v_3 along the z axis should be truncated to $\int_{-a}^{+a} du_3 \int_{-a}^{+a} dv_3$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} iG(y,x) = -e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} \int d^3\hat{u} \int_{-a}^{+a} du_3 \int d^3\hat{v} \int_{-a}^{+a} dv_3 \int \frac{d^3\hat{p}\,dp_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{i\hat{p}(\hat{u}-\hat{x})+ip_3(u_3-x_3)} G_0(\hat{p}) \\ \int \frac{d^3\hat{q}\,dq_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{i\hat{q}(\hat{v}-\hat{u})+iq_3(v_3-u_3)} G_0(\hat{q})\,\gamma^\mu \int \frac{d^3\hat{r}\,dr_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{i\hat{r}(\hat{v}-\hat{u})+ir_3(u_3-v_3)}\ \Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{r},r_3)\,\gamma^\nu \int \frac{d^3\hat{s}\,ds_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{i\hat{s}(\hat{y}-\hat{v})+is_3(y_3-v_3)}\ G_0(\hat{s}) \\ = -e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} \underbrace{\int d^3\hat{u}\ e^{i\hat{u}(\hat{p}-\hat{q}-\hat{r})}}_{(2\pi)^3\delta^3(\hat{p}-\hat{q}-\hat{r})} \underbrace{\int d^3\hat{v}\ e^{i\hat{v}(\hat{q}+\hat{r}-\hat{s})}}_{(2\pi)^3\delta^3(\hat{q}+\hat{r}-\hat{s})} \int_{-a}^{+a} du_3 \int_{-a}^{+a} dv_3 \int \frac{d^3\hat{p}\,dp_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{-i\hat{p}\hat{x}+ip_3(u_3-x_3)} G_0(\hat{p}) \\ \int \frac{d^3\hat{q}\,dq_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{+iq_3(v_3-u_3)} G_0(\hat{q})\,\gamma^\mu \int \frac{d^3\hat{r}\,dr_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ir_3(u_3-v_3)}\ \Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{r},r_3)\,\gamma^\nu \int \frac{d^3\hat{s}\,ds_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{i\hat{s}\hat{y}+is_3(y_3-v_3)}\ G_0(\hat{s}) \\ = -e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} (2\pi)^6 \int_{-a}^{+a} du_3 \int_{-a}^{+a} dv_3 \int \frac{d^3\hat{p}\,dp_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{-i\hat{p}\hat{x}+ip_3(u_3-x_3)} G_0(\hat{p}) \int \frac{d^3\hat{q}\,dq_3}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{+iq_3(v_3-u_3)} G_0(\hat{q})\,\gamma^\mu \\ \int \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ e^{ir_3(v_3-u_3)} \Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\,\gamma^\nu \int \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{ds_3}{2\pi}\ e^{i\hat{p}\hat{y}+is_3(y_3-v_3)} G_0(\hat{p}) \\ = -e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} \int \frac{dq_3}{2\pi} \int \frac{dp_3}{2\pi} \int \frac{dr_3}{2\pi} \int \frac{ds_3}{2\pi} \int_{-a}^{+a} du_3\ e^{iu_3(p_3-q_3-r_3)} \int_{-a}^{+a} dv_3\ e^{iv_3(q_3+r_3-s_3)} \\ \int \frac{d^3\hat{p}}{(2\pi)^3}\ e^{i\hat{p}(\hat{y}-\hat{x})-ip_3x_3+is_3y_3} G_0(\hat{p}) \int \frac{d^3\hat{q}}{(2\pi)^3}\ G_0(\hat{q})\gamma^\mu \Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\gamma^\nu\ G_0(\hat{p}). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The two integrations $\int du_3$ and $\int dv_3$ can be performed since

$$\int_{-a}^{+a} dx\ e^{itx} = \frac{2\sin at}{t}, \tag{5}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} iG(y,x) = -4e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} \int \frac{dp_3}{2\pi}\int\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\int\frac{ds_3}{2\pi}\Big[\int\frac{dq_3}{2\pi}\ \frac{\sin a(q_3+r_3-s_3)}{q_3+r_3-s_3}\ \frac{\sin a(p_3-q_3-r_3)}{p_3-q_3-r_3}\Big] \\ \int\frac{d^3\hat{p}}{(2\pi)^3}\ e^{i\hat{p}(\hat{y}-\hat{x})-ip_3x_3+is_3y_3}G_0(\hat{p})\int\frac{d^3\hat{q}}{(2\pi)^3}\ G_0(\hat{q})\gamma^\mu\Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\gamma^\nu\ G_0(\hat{p}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

In there the integration $\int dq_3$ can also be done explicitly since

$$\int dq_3\ \frac{\sin a(q_3-\sigma)}{q_3-\sigma}\frac{\sin a(q_3-\tau)}{q_3-\tau} = \pi\ \frac{\sin a(\sigma-\tau)}{\sigma-\tau}, \tag{7}$$

with $\sigma = s_3 - r_3, \tau = p_3 - r_3$, which has the property to be independent of r. We get now

$$\begin{aligned} iG(y,x) = -2e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} \int\frac{dp_3}{2\pi}\int\frac{ds_3}{2\pi}\frac{\sin a(s_3-p_3)}{s_3-p_3}\int\frac{d^3\hat{p}}{(2\pi)^3}\ e^{i\hat{p}(\hat{y}-\hat{x})-ip_3x_3+is_3y_3}G_0(\hat{p}) \\ \int\frac{d^3\hat{q}}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ G_0(\hat{q})\gamma^\mu\Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\gamma^\nu\ G_0(\hat{p}). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Going to the new variables $h_3 = s_3 + p_3, l_3 = s_3 - p_3 \Rightarrow dp_3\, ds_3 = \frac{1}{2}dh_3\, dl_3$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} iG(y,x) = -e^2\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)} \int\frac{dl_3}{2\pi}\ \frac{\sin al_3}{l_3}\ e^{il_3\frac{x_3+y_3}{2}}\int\frac{dh_3}{2\pi}e^{ih_3\frac{y_3-x_3}{2}}\int\frac{d^3\hat{p}}{(2\pi)^3}\ e^{i\hat{p}(\hat{y}-\hat{x})}G_0(\hat{p}) \\ \int\frac{d^3\hat{q}}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ G_0(\hat{q})\gamma^\mu\Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\gamma^\nu\ G_0(\hat{p}). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The condition $x_3 + y_3 \leq 2a$ is verified because the electrons are constrained to propagate inside the strip, such that

$$\int\frac{dl_3}{2\pi}\ \frac{\sin al_3}{l_3}\ e^{il_3\frac{x_3+y_3}{2}} = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{10}$$

This yields

$$iG(y,x) = -\frac{e^2}{2}\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)}\int\frac{d^4(\hat{p},\frac{h_3}{2})}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{i\hat{p}(\hat{y}-\hat{x})+i\frac{h_3}{2}(y_3-x_3)}G_0(\hat{p})\int\frac{d^3\hat{q}}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ G_0(\hat{q})\gamma^\mu\Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\gamma^\nu G_0(\hat{p}). \tag{11}$$

$dh_3 = 2d(h_3/2)$; then $h_3/2$ can be indifferently renamed p_3, such that

$$iG(y,x) = -e^2\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ip(y-x)}G_0(\hat{p})\ e^{i|e|q\int_y^x dt_\mu A^\mu(t)}\int\frac{d^3\hat{q}}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ G_0(\hat{q})\gamma^\mu\Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\gamma^\nu G_0(\hat{p}). \tag{12}$$

Chopping off the two external fermion iG_0 propagators leads to

$$\Sigma(x,y) = \Phi(x,y)\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ip(y-x)}\ \Sigma(\hat{p}), \tag{13}$$

with the phase Φ given in (2) and

$$i\Sigma(\hat{p}) = -e^2\int\frac{d^3\hat{q}}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ G_0(\hat{q})\gamma^\mu\Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{p}-\hat{q},r_3)\gamma^\nu. \tag{14}$$

To avoid conflicts between notations, we shall hereafter rather label the momenta like in [2] and write accordingly

$$i\Sigma(\hat{p}) = e^2\int\frac{d^3\hat{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ G_0(\hat{p}-\hat{k})\gamma^\mu\Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{k},r_3)\gamma^\nu. \tag{15}$$

This shows the equivalence with reduced QED$_{3+1}$ on a 2-brane, in which the "effective" internal photon propagator is (see [7])

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}(\hat{k}) = \int \frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ \Delta_{\mu\nu}(\hat{k}, r_3). \tag{16}$$

In the Feynman gauge [7] one gets $\tilde{\Delta}_{\mu\nu}(\hat{k}) = \int \frac{dr_3}{2\pi}\ \frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{\hat{k}^2 + r_3^2} = \frac{1}{2}\ \frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{\sqrt{\hat{k}^2}}$ such that

$$i\Sigma(\hat{p}) = -\frac{e^2}{2}\int \frac{d^3\hat{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\ \gamma^\mu\ G_0(\hat{p}-\hat{k})\ \frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{\sqrt{\hat{k}^2}}\ \gamma^\nu. \tag{17}$$

which should be compared with eq. (3.9) of [2].

No dependence on the thickness a of the medium occurs anymore (unlike for the vacuum polarization [18]). This is easily understood since we constrained the fermion to propagate inside the medium (while, for the vacuum polarization, the photon is allowed to also propagate in the "bulk").

4 The self-energy and self-mass of the electron

4.1 The self-energy in momentum space

We introduce a Schwinger parameter s_2 for the photon, but, instead of $\frac{1}{k^2-i\epsilon} = i\int_0^\infty ds_2\ e^{-is_2(k^2-i\epsilon)}$ (eq. (3.10) of [2]), that is used to represent the 4-dimensional photon propagator in the Feynman gauge, we shall use now, according to (16) and (17)

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{k}^2 - i\epsilon}} = \sqrt{\frac{i}{\pi}}\int_0^\infty ds_2\ \frac{e^{-is_2(\hat{k}^2-i\epsilon)}}{\sqrt{s_2}}, \tag{18}$$

and redo the calculation following [2]. However, it is important (see just above (21)) to use Tsai's [10] formulæ and not the ones used in [2].

Let s_1 be the Schwinger parameter associated to the internal electron propagator. In general QED$_{3+1}$, this propagator is given (see eq. (6) of [10]) by

$$G(k,B) = i\int_0^\infty ds_1\ e^{-is_1\left(m^2 - i\epsilon + k_\parallel^2 + \frac{\tan z}{z}k_\perp^2\right)}\ \frac{e^{iqz\sigma^3}}{\cos z}\Big(m - \not{k}_\parallel - \frac{e^{-iqz\sigma^3}}{\cos z}\not{k}_\perp\Big), \quad z = |e|Bs_1, \tag{19}$$

and, in position space by

$$G(x', x'') = \Phi(x', x'')\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\ e^{ik(x''-x')}\ G(k), \tag{20}$$

with the phase Φ given in (2).

As shown in appendix A, (19) leads to the adequate propagator for the LLL at the limit $B \to \infty$. It is in particular proportional to the customary projector $1 - i\gamma^1\gamma^2$, This is not the case of eq. (2.47b) of [2] (in there $e < 0$), which involves $e^{i\sigma^3 z}$ instead of $e^{iq\sigma^3 z}$ and leads to the wrong projector $1 + i\gamma^1\gamma^2$ and, later, to confusions and problems.

Instead of (3.11) of [2] one gets ("c.t." means "counter terms)

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(\hat{p}) = -\sqrt{\frac{i}{\pi}}\ \frac{e^2}{2}\int_0^\infty ds_1 \int_0^\infty \frac{ds_2}{\sqrt{s_2}}\ \int \frac{d^3\hat{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\ e^{-is_2(\hat{k}^2-i\epsilon)} e^{-is_1\left(m^2 + (\hat{p}-\hat{k})_\parallel^2 + \frac{\tan z}{z}(\hat{p}-\hat{k})_\perp^2\right)} \\ \gamma^\mu\ \frac{e^{iqz\sigma^3}}{\cos z}\Big[m - (\not{\hat{p}} - \not{\hat{k}})_\parallel - \frac{e^{-iqz\sigma^3}}{\cos z}(\not{\hat{p}} - \not{\hat{k}})_\perp\Big]\gamma_\mu + c.t., \quad with\ z = |e|Bs_1,\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Since the Hamiltonian of the Dirac electron is presently considered to be deprived of its $\gamma_3(p-k)_3$ part, $(\hat{p}-\hat{k})_\parallel^2 = -(p_0-k_0)^2$, $(\not{\hat{p}} - \not{\hat{k}})_\parallel = -\gamma_0(p_0-k_0)$, while preserving $(\hat{p}-\hat{k})_\perp^2 = (p_1-k_1)^2 + (p_2-k_2)^2$ and $(\not{p} - \not{k})_\perp = \gamma_1(p_1-k_1) + \gamma_2(p_2-k_2)$.

[7] The choice of a special gauge is of course not optimal but is justified by the property that the formalism of Schwinger is gauge invariant [9].

One performs the same change of variable as (3.12) of [2]

$$s_1 = su, \quad s_2 = s(1-u) \Rightarrow ds_1 \, \frac{ds_2}{\sqrt{s_2}} = ds \, \sqrt{s} \, \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}, \tag{22}$$

and one still introduces $y = |e|Bsu$.

The exponentials are then re-expressed in view of performing the $\int d^3\hat{k}$ integration. Following a procedure identical to that in [2] yields, instead of their (3.17)

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\hat{p}) = -i\frac{e^2}{2}\sqrt{\frac{i}{\pi}}\int_0^\infty ds\sqrt{s} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}} \, \frac{1}{\cos y}\left\{ \int \frac{d^3\hat{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \, e^{-is\chi} \right\} \\ \gamma^\mu e^{iqy\sigma^3}\Big[m - (1-u)\not{p}_\parallel + \frac{e^{-iqy\sigma^3}}{\cos y}\frac{1-u}{1-u+u\tan y/y}\not{p}_\perp\Big]\gamma_\mu + c.t., \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

in which χ and φ are still given by (3.14), (3.15) of [2]

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= um^2 + \varphi + (k_\parallel - up_\parallel)^2 + \big(1-u+u\frac{\tan y}{y}\big)\Big[k_\perp - \frac{u\tan y/y}{1-u+u\tan y/y}\, p_\perp\Big]^2, \\ \varphi &= u(1-u)\, p_\parallel^2 + \frac{u}{y}\frac{(1-u)\sin y}{(1-u)\cos y + u\sin y/y}\, p_\perp^2. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The shifts in the integration variables are naturally $k_\parallel \to k_\parallel - up_\parallel$ and $k_\perp \to k_\perp - -\frac{u\tan y/y}{1-u+u\tan y/y}\, p_\perp$.

One has to redo the k integrations (which only concerns the integral inside curly brackets in (23)) since it is now $\int \frac{d^3\hat{k}}{(2\pi)^3}$ instead of $\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}$ for standard QED$_{3+1}$. This is simple with the aid of the standard integral $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \, e^{\pm iAx^2} = e^{\pm i\pi/4}\left(\frac{\pi}{A}\right)^{1/2}$, $A > 0$ and leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\hat{p}) &= -m\frac{ie^2}{16\pi^2}e^{-i\pi/2}\int_0^\infty ds\sqrt{s}\frac{1}{s^{3/2}}\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}} \, \frac{e^{-is(um^2+\varphi)}}{(1-u)\cos y + u\sin y/y} \\ &\qquad \gamma^\mu e^{iqy\sigma^3}\Big[1 - (1-u)\frac{\not{p}_\parallel}{m} + \frac{e^{-iqy\sigma^3}}{\cos y}\frac{1-u}{1-u+u\tan y/y}\frac{\not{p}_\perp}{m}\Big]\gamma_\mu + c.t. \\ &= -\frac{me^2}{16\pi^2}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s}\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}} \, \frac{e^{-is(um^2+\varphi)}}{(1-u)\cos y + u\sin y/y} \\ &\qquad \gamma^\mu e^{iqy\sigma^3}\Big[1 - (1-u)\frac{\not{p}_\parallel}{m} + \frac{e^{-iqy\sigma^3}}{\cos y}\frac{1-u}{1-u+u\tan y/y}\frac{\not{p}_\perp}{m}\Big]\gamma_\mu + c.t. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

It is then simple matter to perform the Dirac algebra, which leads, instead of eq. (3.27) of [2], to

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\hat{p}) = \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s}\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}} \, \frac{e^{-is(um^2+\varphi)}}{(1-u)\cos y + u\sin y/y} \, e^{iqy\sigma^3} \\ \Big[1 + e^{-2iqy\sigma^3} + (1-u)e^{-2iqy\sigma^3}\frac{\not{p}_\parallel}{m} + (1-u)\frac{e^{-iqy\sigma^3}}{(1-u)\cos y + u\sin y/y}\, \frac{\not{p}_\perp}{m}\Big] + c.t. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Quite remarkably, in addition to the replacement $\sigma^3 y \to q\sigma^3 y$ in the exponentials, which originates from our taking the original Tsai's formula for G_0 instead of that of [2], and to a global factor $1/2$, it only differs from (3.27) of [2] by $\int \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}$ instead of $\int du$ and by the fact that, in the present situation, $p_\parallel^2 = -p_0^2$, $\not{p}_\parallel = -\gamma_0 p_0$. We thus see that, after these lengthy but straightforward transformations have been done, the electron self-energy for QED$_{3+1}$ reduced on a 2-brane is formally very close to the one for QED$_{3+1}$. The difference between the two integration measures for u is however at the origin of the completely different behaviors of the corresponding δm_{LLL} at the limit $m \to 0$, as we shall see in subsection 5.2.1.

4.2 Getting the space representation

Unlike for the vacuum polarization in which the two opposite phases cancel, the phase Φ (given in (2)) plays an important role as far as the self-energy is concerned.

Like for QED$_{3+1}$, the integrations on s and u in (26) cannot be done explicitly. It is however possible, along the lines of p. 47-52 of [2] to get from the space representation a useful expression for $\Sigma(\hat{\pi})$ defined by

$$\Sigma(x',x'') = \Phi(x',x'') \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{-ip(x''-x')}\, \Sigma(\hat{p}) =< x' \mid \Sigma(\hat{\pi}) \mid x'' > . \tag{27}$$

This is an essential step in getting the self-mass δm of an electron on mass-shell ($\not{\pi} + m = 0$).

The $\int d^4p$ in (27), which is at the root of the corresponding formal manipulations stays unchanged. One has to go through the steps of p. 34-36 and p.47-50 of [2], which use in particular (2.41)

$$< X' \mid e^{-is\pi^2} \mid X'' >= \Phi(X',X'') \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{ik(X'-X'')}\, \frac{1}{\cos q|e|Bs}\, e^{-is\left(k_\parallel^2 + k_\perp^2 \frac{\tan q|e|Bs}{q|e|Bs}\right)} \tag{28}$$

and its avatars, (2.45) and more specially (2.46)

$$\begin{aligned} &< X' \mid e^{-is\left(a_0\pi_0\pi^0 + a_3\pi_3\pi^3 + a_\perp \pi_\perp^2\right)}\, \Big(1, \gamma_0\pi^0, \gamma_3\pi^3, \gamma_\perp\pi_\perp\Big) \mid X'' > \\ &= \Phi(X',X'') \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{ik(X'-X'')}\, \frac{1}{\cos q|e|Bsa_\perp}\, e^{-is\left(a_0k_0k^0 + a_3k_3k^3 + a_\perp \frac{\tan q|e|Bsa_\perp}{q|e|Bsa_\perp}\right)} \\ &\qquad\qquad \Big(1, \gamma_0k^0, \gamma_3k^3, \frac{1}{\cos q|e|a_\perp Bs}\, e^{-iq|e|Bsa_\perp\sigma^3}\gamma_\perp p_\perp\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

which entails, by simple changes of variables (φ is given in (24))

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi(X',X'') \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{ip(X'-X'')}\, e^{-is\varphi} = \cos\beta < X' \mid e^{-isu(1-u)p_\parallel^2}\, e^{-i\frac{\beta}{q|e|B}\pi_\perp^2} \mid X'' >, \\ &\Phi(X',X'') \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{ip(X'-X'')}\, e^{-is\varphi}\Big(a\not{p}_\parallel + b\not{p}_\perp\Big) \\ &\qquad = \cos\beta < X' \mid e^{-isu(1-u)p_\parallel^2}\, e^{-i\frac{\beta}{q|e|B}\pi_\perp^2}\Big(a\not{p}_\parallel + b\cos\beta\, e^{iq\sigma^3\beta}\not{p}_\perp\Big) \mid X'' > \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

in which $\Delta(u,y)$ and the angle β have been introduced, which satisfy [2]

$$\begin{aligned} \sin\beta = \frac{(1-u)\sin y}{\Delta(u,y)^{1/2}}, \quad \cos\beta = \frac{(1-u)\cos y + u\sin y/y}{\Delta(u,y)^{1/2}}, \\ \Delta(u,y) = (1-u)^2 + 2u(1-u)\frac{\sin y\cos y}{y} + u^2\Big(\frac{\sin y}{y}\Big)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

After all terms inside (26) have been transformed via (30), one gets the result

$$\begin{aligned} &\Sigma(\hat{\pi}) = \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s}\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-isu^2m^2} \\ &\left[\frac{e^{-is\Theta}}{\sqrt{\Delta(u,y)}}\Big[1 + e^{-2iqy\sigma^3} + (1-u)e^{-2iqy\sigma^3}\,\frac{\not{\pi}}{m} + (1-u)\Big(\frac{1-u}{\Delta(u,y)} + \frac{u}{\Delta(u,y)}\frac{\sin y}{y}\, e^{-iqy\sigma^3} - e^{-2iqy\sigma^3}\Big)\frac{\not{\pi}_\perp}{m}\Big] + c.t.\right], \\ &\Theta = u(1-u)(m^2 - \not{\pi}^2) + \frac{u}{y}\big(\beta - (1-u)y\big)\pi_\perp^2 - u^2\frac{|e|q}{2}\,\sigma_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

which differs from (3.38a) of [2] by the absence of $\gamma_3\pi^3$ from $\not{\pi}$, the same factor $\frac{1}{2}$ that we already mentioned concerning (26), and the presence of $q \equiv -1$ in the exponentials (that was omitted in [2]).

4.2.1 Renormalization conditions and counterterms

The electron mass we define as the pole of its propagator, which is the only gauge invariant definition.

We briefly recall here the general procedure to fix the counterterms. It is then straightforwardly adapted to our concern by replacing everywhere p with $\hat{p}$ and π with $\hat{\pi}$ ($\pi_\mu = p_\mu + |e|A_\mu$).

At $B = 0$, the renormalized electron mass is defined by

$$m = m_0 + \delta m, \quad \delta m = \Sigma(p)\big|_{\not{p}+m=0}, \tag{33}$$

in which m_0 is the bare mass and $\Sigma(p)$ the bare self-energy.

In the presence of and external field A^μ, the propagator of a Dirac electron is

$$iG = \frac{i}{\not{\pi} + m_0 + \Sigma(\pi)}, \tag{34}$$

and we define, in analogy with (33) the mass of the electron as the pole of its propagator by

$$m = m_0 + \Sigma(\pi)\big|_{\not{\pi}+m=0}, \quad \delta m = \Sigma(\pi)\big|_{\not{\pi}+m=0}. \tag{35}$$

δm depends on the external B.

The on mass-shell renormalization conditions write [8]

$$\lim_{\not{\pi}+m=0}\lim_{B\to 0}\Sigma^{ren}(\pi) = 0, \quad \lim_{\not{\pi}+m=0}\lim_{B\to 0}\frac{\partial\Sigma^{ren}(\pi)}{\partial\not{\pi}} = 0, \tag{36}$$

in which the superscript "^{ren}" denotes the renormalized quantities.

They lead to the same counterterms as in [2] but for the simple modifications $p \to \hat{p}, \pi \to \hat{\pi}$, and one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(\hat{\pi}) = \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s}\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-isu^2m^2} \\ \left[\frac{e^{-is\Theta}}{\sqrt{\Delta}}\Big[1 + e^{-2iqy\sigma^3} + (1-u)e^{-2iqy\sigma^3}\,\frac{\not{\hat{\pi}}}{m} + (1-u)\Big(\frac{1-u}{\Delta} + \frac{u}{\Delta}\frac{\sin y}{y}\, e^{-iqy\sigma^3} - e^{-2iqy\sigma^3}\Big)\frac{\not{\hat{\pi}}_\perp}{m}\Big]\right. \\ \left.\underbrace{-(1+u) - (m+\not{\hat{\pi}})\Big(\frac{1-u}{m} - 2imu(1-u^2)s\Big)}_{c.t.}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

in which y, Θ, Δ are given in (32) and (31).

The 2nd counterterm vanishes on mass-shell (since it must satisfy the 1st renormalization condition), and can therefore be forgotten in the calculation of δm.

4.3 The self-mass δm_{LLL} for an electron in the lowest Landau level

The spectrum of a Dirac electron in a pure magnetic field directed along z is [21]

$$\epsilon_n^2 = m^2 + p_z^2 + (2n + 1 + \sigma_z)\,|e|B, \tag{38}$$

in which $\sigma_z = \pm 1$ is 2 $\times$ the spin projection of the electron on the z axis. So, at $n = 0, \sigma_z = -1, p_z = 0$, $\epsilon_n = m$: this is the lowest Landau level.

[8] They are carefully explained p.38-41 of [2].

We can consider $A_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 = 0 \\ A_x = 0 \\ A_y = xB \\ A_z = 0 \end{pmatrix}$ such that $F_{12} = B$ is the only non-vanishing component of the classical external $F_{\mu\nu}$. Then, the wave function of the LLL writes [19] [20]

$$\psi_{n=0,s=-1,p_y=p_z=0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\frac{|e|B}{\pi}\right)^{1/4} e^{-\frac{|e|B}{2}x^2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \; N \overset{[20]}{=} \underbrace{L_y \, L_z}_{dimensions \; along \; y \; and \; z} . \tag{39}$$

Following (35), in order to determine δm for the (on mass-shell) LLL, we shall sandwich the general self-energy operator (37) between two states $\mid \psi >$ defined in (39) and satisfying $(\hat{\not{\pi}} + m) \mid \psi >= 0$.

The expression (37) involves $\hat{\not{\pi}}$ that we shall replace by $-m$, Δ that needs not be transformed, and Θ which involves $m^2 - \hat{\not{\pi}}^2$, $\pi_\perp^2$ and $\sigma_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$. The only non-vanishing component of $F^{\mu\nu}$ being $F^{12} = B$, $\sigma_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} = \sigma_{12}F^{12} + \sigma_{21}F^{21} = 2\sigma_{12}F^{12} \equiv 2\sigma_3 B$.

Since the electron is an eigenstate of the Dirac equation in the presence of B, $m^2 - \hat{\not{\pi}}^2$ can be taken to vanish. $\pi_\perp^2 \equiv \pi_1^2 + \pi_2^2$ is also identical, since the LLL has $p_z = 0$ and we work in a gauge with $A_z = 0$, to $\vec{\pi}^2 \equiv \pi^2 + \pi_0^2$. One has $\not{\pi}^2 = -\pi^2 + \frac{q|e|}{2}\sigma_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ such that $\pi_\perp^2 = -\hat{\not{\pi}}^2 + \pi_0^2 + \sigma_3 \, q|e|B$. Since our gauge for the external B has $A_0 = 0$, $\pi_0^2 = p_0^2$, which is the energy squared of the electron, identical to m^2 for the LLL. Therefore, on mass-shell, $\pi_\perp^2 = \sigma_3 \, q|e|B$. When sandwiched between LLL,

$< \psi \mid \sigma^3 \mid \psi >= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} diag(1,-1,1,-1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = -1$ such that σ^3 can be replaced by (-1). Θ shrinks to $u(\beta/y - 1)q|e|B\sigma^3$, which gives, replacing σ^3 with (-1), $\Theta \to u(1 - \beta/y)q|e|B$. σ^3 can also be replaced by (-1) in the exponentials of (37).

$\Sigma(\hat{\pi})$ in (37) also involves a term proportional to $\not{\pi}_\perp$. Since the LLL has $p_z = 0$ and we work at $A_z = 0$, this is also equal to $\vec{\gamma}.\vec{\pi} = \gamma^\mu \hat{\pi}_\mu - \gamma^0 \pi_0 = \hat{\not{\pi}} + \gamma^0 p^0$. $< \psi \mid \hat{\not{\pi}} \mid \psi >= -m$ such that
$< \psi \mid \not{\pi}_\perp \mid \psi >=< \psi \mid -m + \gamma^0 p^0 \mid \psi >$. Since $\gamma^0 = diag(1,1,-1,-1)$, eq. (39) yields $< \psi \mid \not{\pi}_\perp \mid \psi >= -m + p^0$. The energy p^0 of the LLL $\mid \psi >$ being equal to m, this term vanishes.

Gathering all information and simplifications leads finally to

$$\delta m_{LLL} \equiv \Sigma(\hat{\pi})_{\hat{\not{\pi}}+m=0} = \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}} \, e^{-isu^2m^2} \left[\frac{e^{-is\Theta(u,y)}}{\sqrt{\Delta(u,y)}} \, (1 + u \, e^{2iqy}) - \underbrace{(1+u)}_{from \; c.t.} \right], \tag{40}$$

in which $y = |e|Bsu$ as before, $\Delta(u,y)$ is the same as in (32), β the same as in (31), and Θ has shrunk down to

$$\Theta(u,y) = uq|e|B\Big(1 - \frac{\beta(u,y)}{y}\Big) = uq|e|B - \frac{\beta(u,y)}{s}. \tag{41}$$

5 The "reduced" Demeur-Jancovici integral $\hat{I}(L)$

5.1 General expression

We define $\hat{I}(L)$ by

$$\delta m_{LLL} = \frac{\alpha\, m}{4\pi}\, \hat{I}(L) \quad with\ L = \frac{|e|B}{m^2}. \tag{42}$$

such that

$$\hat{I}(L) = \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-isu^2m^2} \left[\frac{e^{-is\Theta(u,y)}}{\sqrt{\Delta(u,y)}}\, (1 + u\, e^{2iqy}) - \underbrace{(1+u)}_{from\ c.t.} \right] \tag{43}$$

By a successive change of variables, we shall cast it in a form similar to $I(L)$ deduced by Jancovici in [5] from the formula obtained by Demeur in [4], and that was revisited in [3].

It is interesting to expand $e^{i\beta}$ into $\cos\beta + i\sin\beta$ and to use the expressions (31) of $\cos\beta$ and $\sin\beta$ to cast δm in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I} &= \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-iuy\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \Big[\frac{e^{-iqy}\big((1-u)\cos y + u \sin y/y + i(1-u)\sin y\big)}{\Delta(u,y)} \big(1 + ue^{2iqy}\big) - (1-u) \Big] \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-iuy\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \Big[\frac{1 - u + u\sin y/y\; e^{-iqy}}{\Delta(u,y)} \big(1 + ue^{2iqy}\big) - (1-u) \Big] \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

then to notice that $\Delta(u,y) = (1 - u + u\frac{\sin y}{y}\, e^{+iqy})(1 - u + u\frac{\sin y}{y}\, e^{-iqy})$ to simplify the previous expression into

$$\hat{I} = \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-iuy\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \Big[\frac{1 + ue^{2iqy}}{1 - u + u\frac{\sin y}{y}\, e^{+iqy}} - (1+u) \Big] \tag{45}$$

After the change of variables (we shall come back later to this change of variables which introduces in particular a dependence of the counterterm on L)

$$(u,s) \to (u, y = |e|Bsu) \Rightarrow \frac{du\, ds}{s} = \frac{du\, dy}{y} = du\, \frac{d(qy)}{qy}, \tag{46}$$

it becomes

$$\hat{I} = \int_0^{q\infty} \frac{d(qy)}{qy} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-iuy\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \Big[\frac{1 + ue^{2iqy}}{1 - u + u\frac{\sin qy}{qy}\, e^{+iqy}} - (1+u) \Big] \tag{47}$$

Noticing that, since $q = -1$, $\sin y/y = \sin qy/qy$ and expressing $\sin qy$ in the denominator in terms of complex exponentials gives

$$\hat{I}(L) = \int_0^{q\infty} d(qy) \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-iuy\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \left[\frac{2i\,\big(1 + u\, e^{2iqy}\big)}{2iqy(1-u) + u\,(e^{2iqy} - 1)} - \frac{1+u}{qy} \right]. \tag{48}$$

Going to $t = -iqy$ yields

$$\hat{I}(L) = \int_0^{-iq\infty} dt \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{uqt\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \left[\frac{2\,\big(1 + u\, e^{-2t}\big)}{2t(1-u) + u\,(1 - e^{-2t})} - \frac{1+u}{t} \right]. \tag{49}$$

Last, we change to $z = ut \Rightarrow du\, dt = \frac{du\, dz}{u}$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}(L) &= \int_0^{-iq\infty} dz \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{zq\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \left[\frac{2\,\big(1 + u\, e^{-2z/u}\big)}{2z(1-u) + u^2\,\big(1 - e^{-2z/u}\big)} - \frac{1+u}{z} \right] \\ &\overset{q=-1}{=} \int_0^{+i\infty} dz \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-z\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \left[\frac{2\,\big(1 + u\, e^{-2z/u}\big)}{2z(1-u) + u^2\,\big(1 - e^{-2z/u}\big)} - \frac{1+u}{z} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

The last operation to perform is a Wick rotation. $\int_0^{+i\infty} + \int_{1/4\ infinite\ circle} + \int_\infty^0 = 2i\pi \sum residues$. Because of $e^{-z\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}$ the contribution on the infinite 1/4 circle is vanishing. That the residue at $z = 0$ vanishes is trivial as long as u is not strictly vanishing. The expansion of the terms between square brackets in (50) at $z \to 0$ writes indeed $u-1+(-\frac{5}{3}+\frac{4}{3u}+u)z+\left(-\frac{7}{3}-\frac{1}{u^2}+\frac{7}{3u}+u\right)z^2+\mathcal{O}(z^3)$, which seemingly displays poles at $u = 0$. However, without expanding, it also writes, then, $\frac{2}{2z}-\frac{1}{z} = 0$, which shows that the poles at $u = 0$ in the expansion at $z \to 0$ are fake and that the residue at $z = 0$ always vanishes. Other poles (we now consider eq. (49)) can only occur when the denominator of the first term inside brackets vanishes. That the corresponding $u_{pole} = \frac{2t}{2t+e^{-2t}-1}$ should be real constrains them to occur at $t \to in\pi, n \in \mathbb{N} > 0$ and $u \to 1$. In general, they satisfy $2t(1-u)+u(1-e^{-2t}) = 0$ which, setting $t = t_1 + it_2, t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, yields the 2 equations $e^{-2t_1}\ \cos 2t_2 = 1 + 2\eta t_1,\ e^{-2t_1}\ \sin 2t_2 = -2\eta t_2,\ \eta = \frac{1-u}{u} \geq 0$. Since $t_1 \to 0$, one may expand the first relation at this limit, which yields $\cos 2t_2 - 1 = 2t_1(\eta + \cos 2t_2)$. As $t_2 \to n\pi$, $\cos 2t_2 > 0$ and $\cos 2t_2 - 1 < 0$, which, since $\eta > 0$, constrains t_1 to stay negative [9] . Therefore, the potentially troublesome poles lie in reality on the left of the imaginary t axis along which the integration is done and should not be accounted for when doing a Wick rotation. It gives (we change u into v to work from now onwards with the same notation as in [5] and ease the comparison)

$$\hat{I}(L) = \int_0^\infty dz \int_0^1 \frac{dv}{\sqrt{1-v}}\, e^{-z\frac{m^2}{|e|B}} \left[\frac{2\left(1+v\,e^{-2z/v}\right)}{2z(1-v)+v^2\left(1-e^{-2z/v}\right)} - \underbrace{\frac{1+v}{z}}_{from\ c.t.} \right]. \tag{51}$$

which is the expression which we shall focus on hereafter.

5.2 Analytical evaluation of $\hat{I}(L)$

Let us call

$$f(v,z) = \frac{2(1+ve^{-2z/v})}{2z(1-v)+v^2(1-e^{-2z/v})} - \frac{1+v}{z}, \tag{52}$$

such that

$$\hat{I}(L) = \int_0^\infty dz\, e^{-z/L} \int_0^1 \frac{dv}{\sqrt{1-v}}\, f(v,z). \tag{53}$$

That $\hat{I}(L)$ would be divergent at $z = 0$ without the counterterm can be easily seen by expanding $\frac{2\left(1+v\,e^{-2z/v}\right)}{2z(1-v)+v^2\left(1-e^{-2z/v}\right)} \overset{z\to 0}{\sim} \frac{1+v}{z} + v - 1 + \mathcal{O}(z)$

5.2.1 An approximation

We split $\int_0^\infty dz\ (...)$ in $\hat{I}(L)$ given by (51) into $\int_0^{z_0} dz\ (...) + \int_{z_0}^\infty dz\ (...)$, with:

* z_0 large enough such that, in the 2nd integral, in which $z > z_0$, $f(v,z) \simeq \frac{2}{2z(1-v)+v^2} - \frac{1+v}{z}$, that is, the exponentials can be neglected;

* z_0 small enough for $\int_0^{z_0} dz\ (...) \ll \int_0^\infty dz\ (...) \simeq \int_{z_0}^\infty dz\ (...)$ and can be neglected.

In practice, $z_0 = 1$ fits perfectly and, even down to $L = 20$, the ratio of the 2 integrals is $\leq 1/100$.

$\int_0^{z_0} dz\ (...)$ involves two canceling divergent integrals, and, for proper numerical evaluation, one has to set the lower bound of integration to $\epsilon \neq 0$, checking stability when ϵ decreases from 10^{-3} down to 10^{-12} ....

Likewise, to numerically evaluate $\int_{z_0\simeq 1}^\infty (\ldots)$, avoiding to deal with too small numbers requires to set the upper bound of integration at a large but number (which depends on the value of L) instead of infinity and to check stability by varying this bound inside a large interval.

[9] The 2nd relation then tells us that $\sin 2t_2 < 0$, which means that the poles correspond to $t_2 = n\pi - \epsilon, \epsilon > 0$.

The result is that, for $L \geq 20$ and $z_0 \simeq 1$ one can approximate at a precision better than $1/100$

$$\hat{I}(L) \approx \int_{z_0 \simeq 1}^{\infty} dz\, e^{-z/L} \int_0^1 \frac{dv}{\sqrt{1-v}} \Big[\frac{2}{2z(1-v)+v^2} - \frac{1+v}{z}\Big]. \tag{54}$$

One has

$$g(z) \equiv \int_0^1 \frac{dv}{\sqrt{1-v}}\, \frac{2}{2z(1-v)+v^2} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{z(z-2)}} \left[\frac{\tan^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-1+z-\sqrt{z(z-2)}}}}{\sqrt{-1+z-\sqrt{z(z-2)}}} - \frac{\tan^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-1+z+\sqrt{z(z-2)}}}}{\sqrt{-1+z+\sqrt{z(z-2)}}} \right],$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 dv\, \frac{1+v}{\sqrt{1-v}} = \frac{10}{3}, \\ &\int_{z_0 \simeq 1}^{\infty} dz\, \frac{e^{-z/L}}{z} = \Gamma(0, 1/L), \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

therefore

$$\delta m_{LLL} = \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi} \Big(\int_{z_0 \approx 1}^{\infty} dz\, e^{-z/L}\, g(z) - \frac{10}{3} \Gamma(0, 1/L) \Big) \tag{56}$$

or, equivalently

$$\hat{I}(L) \approx \int_{z_0 \approx 1}^{\infty} dz\, e^{-z/L}\, g(z) - \frac{10}{3}\, \Gamma(0, 1/L). \tag{57}$$

On Fig. 2 we compare $g(z)$ given in (55) (blue) with the one obtained in [3] for standard QED$_{3+1}$ $\big(g(z) = \ln(z-1+\sqrt{z(z-2)})/\sqrt{z(z-2)} \simeq \ln z/z + \pi/2z^{1.175}\big)$ (yellow).



Fig. 2: A comparison between the integrand $g(z)$ in QED$_{3+1}$ (yellow) and in QED$_{3+1}$ reduced on a 2-brane (blue)

We now proceed like M.I. Vysotsky in [22] and look for an interpolating function for $g(z)$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} &g(1) \approx 3.468, \\ &g(z) \overset{z \to \infty}{\simeq} \pi \sqrt{\frac{2}{z}} - \frac{2}{z} + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{z^{3/2}}) \simeq \frac{4.443}{\sqrt{z}} + \dots \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

and an excellent fit for $z \in [z_0 \simeq 1, \infty]$ is

$$g(z) \approx \pi \sqrt{\frac{2}{z}} + \frac{g(1) - \pi\sqrt{2}}{z}. \tag{59}$$

It is plotted in yellow on Fig. 3, while the exact g is in blue.



Fig. 3: exact (blue) and approximated (yellow) $g(z)$ for $z \geq 1$

This approximation gives [10]

$$\hat{I}(L) = \pi\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{L}\sqrt{\pi}\; Erfc(\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}) + \big(g(1) - \pi\sqrt{2}\big)\Gamma\big(0, \frac{1}{L}\big) - \frac{10}{3}\Gamma\big(0, \frac{1}{L}\big), \tag{60}$$

and, using (42)

$$\delta m_{LLL} \equiv \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\,\hat{I}(L) = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\frac{\sqrt{|e|B}}{\sqrt{L}}\,\hat{I}(L) = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\sqrt{|e|B}\left[\sqrt{2}\,\pi^{3/2}\; Erfc(\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}) + \frac{\Gamma(0,\frac{1}{L})}{\sqrt{L}}\Big(g(1) - \pi\sqrt{2} - \frac{10}{3}\Big)\right]. \tag{61}$$

When $L \to \infty$, $Erfc(\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}) \simeq 1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} + \ldots$ and $\Gamma(0, \frac{1}{L}) \simeq \ln L - \gamma_E + \ldots$ such that

$$\delta m_{LLL} \overset{L\to\infty}{\simeq} \frac{\alpha}{2}\,\sqrt{|e|B}\,\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\left[1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi L}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\,\pi^{3/2}}\frac{\ln L - \gamma_E}{\sqrt{L}}\big(g(1) - \pi\sqrt{2} - \frac{10}{3}\big) + \ldots\right]. \tag{62}$$

The constant term comes from the contribution to $\hat{I}(L)$ of $\int_{z_0\simeq 1}^{\infty} dz\; e^{-z/L}/\sqrt{z} = \sqrt{\pi L}\; Erf(\sqrt{z/L})\Big|_{z_0\simeq 1}^{\infty}$ at ∞. So, it is not sensitive to the precise value of $z_0 = 1$, but it is controlled by the leading behavior of $g(z) \sim 1/\sqrt{z}$ at $z \to \infty$ [11].

It is important to check that, at the limit of large L, the first integral $\int_0^{z_0=1} dz(\ldots)$ is stable and can still be neglected with respect to the second integral. This is shown on Fig. 4-left, in which we plot the 1st integral as a function of L. As already mentioned, the numerical cancellation of infinities requires that the lower bound of integration be set not to 0 but to smaller and smaller ϵ. The curve in blue corresponds to $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$, and the 3 other curves, green, yellow and red, corresponding to $\epsilon = 10^{-6}, 10^{-9}, 10^{-12}$ are superposed; $\hat{I}(L)$ as given by (60) is plotted on Fig. 4-right. We see that, even at very large values of L, the 1st integral can always be safely neglected inside $\hat{I}(L)$.



Fig. 4: on the left: value of the 1st (neglected inside $\hat{I}(L)$) integral $\int_0^{z_0=1} dz(...)$ for lower bounds of integrations going from 10^{-3} (blue) to 10^{-12} (yellow, green, red); on the right : $\hat{I}(L)$

[10] $Erfc(x) = 1 - Erf(x)$.

[11] By comparison, in the case of standard QED$_{3+1}$, the leading behavior of $g(z)$ when $z \to \infty$ being $g(z) \overset{z\to\infty}{\sim} \ln z/z$, one gets $I(L) \sim \int_{z_0\simeq 1}^{\infty} dz\, e^{-z/L} \ln z/z \sim constant$, which yields $\delta m_{LLL} \sim \frac{\alpha m}{2\pi}.constant \overset{m\to 0}{\to} 0$.

6 A non-vanishing 1-loop δm_{LLL} at $m \to 0$

From (62) one gets immediately (restoring $\hbar$ and c)

$$\delta m_{LLL} \overset{m\to 0}{\to} \frac{\alpha}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar|e|B}{c^2}}, \tag{63}$$

which shows that, in an external magnetic field, this model, equivalent to reduced QED$_{3+1}$ on a 2-brane, cannot stay massless at 1-loop. Notice that (63) fulfills the renormalization conditions (36), which are expressed at $B = 0$.

Since the role of the counterterms is slightly more subtle than for QED$_{3+1}$ (in which they yield the large logs (see [3])), it is useful to make some comments about them.

In (40), the (infinite) counterterm only depends on m through the exponential $e^{-isu^2m^2}$ inside the integrand.

Noting respectively $b.term$ and $c.term$ the bare term and the counterterm inside the expression (40) of δm_{LLL}, one can write symbolically $b.term = +\infty + f_1(m, eB), \quad c.term = -\infty + f_2(m)$, in which f_1, f_2 are finite.
The change of variables (46) introduces a dependence of both on L, that we write symbolically $b.term = +\infty + \hat{f}_1(m, eB, L) + \zeta(L) = +\infty + h_1(m, eB, L), \quad c.term = -\infty + \hat{f}_2(m, L) - \zeta(L) = -\infty + h_2(m, L)$. Therefore, via the change of variable (46), the counterterm has reacted on the bare contribution and the two become entangled (we introduced $\pm\zeta$ to picture the fact that this dependence globally cancels but, in practice, one cannot "isolate" ζ ; also, strictly speaking, these terms are not defined before the infinities are regularized and canceled).

The "educated" splitting [5] of the z interval of integration $[0, \infty[= [0, z_0] + [z_0, \infty[$ brings then $\hat{I}(L)$ down to the approximation (54). Let us call the integrands in there $h_1^{z_0}(m, eB, L)$ and $h_2^{z_0}(m, L)$. That the limit $m \to 0$ yields a constant δm, or, equivalently, $\hat{I}(L) \propto \sqrt{L}$. is due to $h_1^{z_0}$ (and the corresponding $g(z)$ defined in (57) (59)) which has an asymptotic expansion $\simeq 1/\sqrt{z}$ at $z \to \infty$. This makes the result insensitive to the precise value of z_0. By contrast, as we have mentioned, in standard QED$_{3+1}$, the asymptotic behavior of $g(z)$ is $\ln z/z$ [3].

$h_1^{z_0}$ no longer represents the bare contribution for the reasons that we just evoked: * a change of variables introduced an extra dependence on L that mixes with the counterterm; * the splitting of the z interval of integration collects in the neglected (small) $\int_0^{z_0} dz(\ldots)$, in particular, the two canceling infinite parts of the bare term and of the counterterm, establishing a second connection between the two. In this respect, both play crucial roles in the massless limit of δ_{LLL}, that can hardly be disentangled.

Last, let us remark that it is necessary to make the z integration at $m \neq 0$ *before taking the limit* $m \to 0$, otherwise, since $L = |e|B/m^2$, one gets the undetermined expression $\frac{1}{0} \times 0$. Had we started from a massless theory, we would have obtained such an undetermined result. This is why one can only state that *the massless limit* of the 1-loop δm_{LLL} goes to a constant, or, equivalently, that the model under consideration cannot stay massless at 1-loop.

7 Restricting to the lowest Landau level of the virtual electron

7.1 Basics

The contribution of different Landau levels to the propagator of an electron in a constant uniform external B has been investigated in [23] and [24]. From eqs.(22,23,24) of [23] one gets

$$\begin{aligned} G(x,x') &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} G^n(x,x') = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{i\omega(x,x')}\ \hat{G}^n(x-x') \\ &= e^{i\omega(x,x')} \int \frac{d^4p}{(2pi)^4}\ e^{-ip(x-x')} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{G}^n(p,B), \\ \omega(x,x') &= -\frac{|e|B}{2}(x_1+x_1')(x_2-x_2'), \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

in which $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3), x' = (x'_0, x'_1, x'_2, x'_3)$. The factor $e^{i\omega(x,x')}$ is identical to Schwinger's $\Phi(x, x')$ as written in (2) (see for example [20], chapter 3).

Using the conventions and metric $(-+++)$ of Schwinger, the contribution of the LLL is

$$-i\hat{G}^{n=0}(p,B) = e^{-p_\perp^2/|e|B}\int_0^\infty ds_1\, e^{-is_1(m^2+p_\parallel^2)}(m-\not{p}_\parallel)(1-i\gamma_1\gamma_2), \tag{65}$$

in which we have introduced the Schwinger's parameter s_1 (see also appendix A).

To determine the contribution of the LLL of the virtual electron to the self-energy, we have to calculate (see (17))

$$i\Sigma^{n=0}(\hat{p},B) = -\frac{e^2}{2}\int\frac{d^3\hat{p}}{(2\pi)^3}\,\gamma^\mu\hat{G}^{n=0}(\hat{p}-\hat{k},B)\frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{\sqrt{\hat{k}^2}}\gamma^\nu \tag{66}$$

One introduces as before the Schwinger parameter s_2 for the photon propagator

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{k}^2-i\epsilon}} = \sqrt{\frac{i}{\pi}}\int_0^\infty\frac{ds_2}{\sqrt{s_2}} \tag{67}$$

and, instead of eq. (3.11) of [2], one gets

$$\Sigma^{n=0}(p,B) = -ie^2\int_0^\infty ds_1\sqrt{\frac{i}{\pi}}\int_0^\infty\frac{ds_2}{\sqrt{s_2}}\int\frac{d^3\hat{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\,e^{-\frac{(p-k)_\perp^2}{|e|B}}\,e^{-is_2(\hat{k}^2-i\epsilon)}\,e^{-is_1\left(m^2+(\hat{p}-\hat{k})_\parallel^2\right)}\,\gamma^\mu\big(m-(\not{p}_\parallel-\not{k}_\parallel)\big)(1-i\gamma_1\gamma_2)\gamma_\mu. \tag{68}$$

The change of variables (3.12) of [2] is the same

$$s_1 = su, \quad s_2 = s(1-u) \Rightarrow ds_1\,\frac{ds_2}{\sqrt{s_2}} = ds\,\sqrt{s}\,\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}, \tag{69}$$

and

$$z = |e|Bs_1, \quad y = |e|Bus. \tag{70}$$

Like before, aiming at performing the integration $\int d^3\hat{k}$, one rewrites the exponentials (watch the "i" which now occurs). Since s cannot be factorized everywhere, we have now included it into the definitions of χ_0 and φ_0, unlike previously for χ and φ.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(p-k)_\perp^2}{i|e|B} + s_2\hat{k}^2 + s_1\big(m^2+(\hat{p}-\hat{k})_\parallel^2\big)\\
&= usm^2 + su(1-u)\hat{p}_\parallel^2 + s(\hat{k}-u\hat{p})_\parallel^2 + \Big(s(1-u)+\frac{1}{i|e|B}\Big)\Big(k_\perp - \frac{p_\perp}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\Big)^2 + p_\perp^2\frac{s(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\\
&= \chi_0 + \varphi_0,\\
&\chi_0 = s(\hat{k}-u\hat{p})_\parallel^2 + \Big(s(1-u)+\frac{1}{i|e|B}\Big)\Big(k_\perp - \frac{p_\perp}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\Big)^2,\\
&\varphi_0 = usm^2 + su(1-u)\hat{p}_\parallel^2 + p_\perp^2\frac{s(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)} = usm^2 + b_0\hat{p}_\parallel^2 + b_\perp p_\perp^2,\\
&\qquad b_0 = us(1-u), \quad b_\perp = \frac{s(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)},
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

such that

$$\Sigma^{n=0}(p,B) = -i\frac{e^2}{2}\int_0^\infty ds\,\sqrt{s}\sqrt{\frac{i}{\pi}}\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\int\frac{d^3\hat{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\,e^{-i(\chi_0+\varphi_0)}\,\gamma^\mu\big(m-(\not{p}_\parallel-\not{k}_\parallel)\big)(1-i\gamma_1\gamma_2)\gamma_\mu. \tag{72}$$

One then shifts the variables $k_\parallel \to r_\parallel = k_\parallel - up_\parallel$, $k_\perp \to r_\perp = k_\perp - \frac{p_\perp}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}$. One has $\chi_0 = s\hat{r}_\parallel^2 + \Big(s(1-u)+\frac{1}{i|e|B}\Big)r_\perp^2$.

Then, $(m-\gamma^0(k^0-p^0))=m-\gamma^0(r^0+(u-1)p^0)$. χ_0 being even since it depends on r_0^2, the odd term $\propto r_0$ yields a vanishing contribution to the $\int dk_0$. One can thus replace $m-\gamma^0(k^0-p^0)$ by $m-(u-1)\gamma^0p^0$. One gets

$$\Sigma^{n=0}(p,B)=-i\frac{e^2}{2}\sqrt{\frac{i}{\pi}}\int_0^\infty ds\sqrt{s}\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\int\frac{d^3\hat{r}}{(2\pi)^3}\;e^{-i\varphi_0}\;e^{-i[sr_\parallel^2+(s(1-u)+1/i|e|B)r_\perp^2]}\gamma^\mu\big(m+(u-1)\not{p}_\parallel\big)(1-i\gamma_1\gamma_2)\gamma_\mu. \tag{73}$$

Since

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}dx\;e^{\pm iAx^2}=e^{\pm i\pi/4}(\frac{\pi}{A})^{1/2}, \tag{74}$$

one gets

$$\int d^3\hat{r}\;e^{-i\chi}=e^{-i\pi/4}\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{s}}(\sqrt{\pi}e^{-i\pi/4})^2\frac{1}{s(1-u)+1/i|e|B}, \tag{75}$$

and, since $\sqrt{i}=e^{i\pi/4}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{n=0}(p,B)&=-\frac{e^2}{16\pi^2}\int_0^\infty ds\sqrt{s}\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\;e^{-i\varphi_0}\;\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}[s(1-u)+1/i|e|B]}\gamma^\mu\big(m+(1-u)\gamma^0p^0\big)(1-i\gamma_1\gamma_2)\gamma_\mu\\&=-\frac{e^2}{16\pi^2}\int_0^\infty ds\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\;e^{-i\varphi_0}\;\frac{i|e|B}{1+i|e|B\,s(1-u)}\gamma^\mu\big(m+(1-u)\gamma^0p^0\big)(1-i\gamma_1\gamma_2)\gamma_\mu.\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

Next, one performs the Dirac algebra

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma^\mu\big(m+(1-u)\gamma^0p^0\big)(1-i\gamma_1\gamma_2)\gamma_\mu&=-4m+2im\gamma_1\gamma_2+2(1-u)p^0\gamma^0+2i(1-u)p^0\gamma^0\gamma_1\gamma_2\\&=-4m+2(1-u)p^0\gamma^0(1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2),\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

such that

$$\Sigma^{n=0}(p,B)=-\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\int_0^\infty ds\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\;e^{-isum^2}e^{-i(b_0\hat{p}_\parallel^2+b_\perp p_\perp^2)}\;\frac{i|e|B}{1+i|e|B\,s(1-u)}\big[-2m+(1-u)p^0\gamma^0(1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2)\big]+c.t., \tag{78}$$

in which b_0 and $b_\perp$ are given in (71) and where we have now mentioned the counterterms (c.t.) that need eventually to be introduced to fulfill suitable renormalization conditions.

We are interested in δm^0_{LLL} concerning external electrons in the LLL. To get it we sandwich $\Sigma(\pi)$ between two LLL eigenstates. Since these are annihilated by $1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2$, the only term that may play a role is the one proportional to m. Accordingly, the quantity of interest to us is

$$\Sigma^{n=0}_{LLL}(p,B)=\frac{\alpha\,m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty ds\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\;e^{-isum^2}e^{-is(1-u)\Big(u\hat{p}_\parallel^2+\dfrac{p_\perp^2}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\Big)}\;\frac{i|e|B}{1+i|e|B\,s(1-u)}+c.t. \tag{79}$$

7.2 Getting the space representation

One needs to determine $\Sigma(\pi)$ satisfying (27). To that purpose, one must find the suitable change of variables to adapt (2.45) (2.46) of [2] to the present situation, that is to determine a_0 and $a_\perp$ in (29 (which is the same as (2.46) of [2]). One must have

$$\begin{aligned}&\exp[-isa_\perp p_\perp^2\frac{\tan|e|Bsa_\perp}{|e|Bsa_\perp}]=\exp[-is(1-u)\frac{p_\perp^2}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}]\\&\Leftrightarrow\tan|e|Bsa_\perp=\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\Leftrightarrow a_\perp=\frac{1}{|e|Bs}\tan^{-1}\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}.\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Then

$$\cos|e|Bsa_\perp=\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}. \tag{81}$$

One also has trivially

$$-isa_0(-p_0^2) = -isu(1-u)(-p_0^2) \Leftrightarrow a_0 = u(1-u). \tag{82}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{n=0}(\pi_0,\pi_\perp) = \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty ds \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\left[\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\right]\frac{i|e|B}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)} \\ e^{-isum^2}\, e^{-isu(1-u)(-\pi_0^2)}\, e^{-is\pi_\perp^2\left(\frac{1}{|e|Bs}\tan^{-1}\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\right)} + c.t.\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

7.3 Renormalization conditions and counterterms

Let us consider general on mass-shell external electrons. Since renormalization conditions have to be expressed at $B = 0$, let us also consider the limit $B \to 0$ of $\Sigma^{n=0}(\pi)$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{n=0}(\pi_0,\pi_\perp) &\overset{B\to 0}{\sim} \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty ds\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\left[\cos 0\right]\frac{i|e|B}{1+0} \\ &e^{-isum^2}\, e^{-isu(1-u)(-\pi_0^2)}\, e^{-is\pi_\perp^2\left(\frac{1}{|e|Bs}\arctan\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+0}\right)} + terms \propto (1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2) + c.t \\ &\sim \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty ds\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\, i|e|B\, e^{-isum^2}\, e^{isu(1-u)\pi_0^2}\, e^{-i\pi_\perp^2}\,\frac{1}{|e|B}|e|Bs(1-u) + terms \propto (1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2) + c.t\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

We then go through the successive changes of variables $(u,s) \to (u, y = |e|Bsu)$, $t = iy$, last $z = ut$, plus a Wick rotation (see subsection 7.4 below), to get

$$\Sigma^{n=0}(\pi_0,\pi_\perp) \overset{B\to 0}{\sim} \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty dz\int_0^1 \frac{du}{u^2\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-\frac{zm^2}{u|e|B}}\, e^{z\frac{1-u}{u}\frac{\pi_0^2}{|e|B}\,\pi_0^2}\, e^{-z\frac{1-u}{u^2}\,\frac{\pi_\perp^2}{|e|B}} + terms \propto (1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2) + c.t \tag{85}$$

If we now go on mass-shell, $\not{\pi} + m = 0$, $\not{\pi}^2 = m^2 = -\pi^2 - \frac{|e|}{2}2\sigma^3 B \Rightarrow m^2 = \pi_0^2 - \pi_\perp^2 - |e|\sigma^3 B$, we get

$$\Sigma^{n=0}_{mass-shell}(\pi_0,\pi_\perp) \overset{B\to 0}{\sim} \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty dz\int_0^1 \frac{du}{u^2\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-z\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\, e^{z\frac{1-u}{u}\sigma^3}\, e^{-z\frac{(1-u)^2}{u^2}\frac{\pi_\perp^2}{|e|B}} + terms \propto (1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2) + c.t \tag{86}$$

The 1st renormalization condition in (36) concerns the vanishing, on mass-shell, of Σ at the limit $B \to 0$. We have therefore to introduce a 1st counterterm $c.t._1$

$$c.t._1 = -\lim_{B\to 0}\frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty dz\int_0^1 \frac{du}{u^2\sqrt{1-u}}\, e^{-z\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\, e^{z\frac{1-u}{u}\sigma^3}\, e^{-z\frac{(1-u)^2}{u^2}\frac{\pi_\perp^2}{|e|B}} + terms \propto (1+i\gamma_1\gamma_2) \tag{87}$$

(the terms $\propto (1 + i\gamma^1\gamma^2)$ give vanishing contribution only to external LLL).

The second renormalization condition (see (36)) concerns the derivative of Σ. This leads to introducing a second set of counterterms. However, they have to vanish on mass-shell since they must satisfy the 1st renormalization condition. Since, in order to calculate δm, we precisely work on mass-shell, we can forget about the second set of counterterms and proceed now with the calculation of δm^0_{LLL}.

7.4 Calculation of the 1-loop self-mass δm^0_{LLL} when both external and internal electrons are in the lowest Landau level

Like before, when acting on external LLL electrons, and on mass-shell, $\pi_0^2 = m^2, \pi_\perp^2 = \sigma^3 eB = -eB = +|e|B$. Therefore

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} = \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty ds \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}\Big]\frac{i|e|B}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}e^{-isu^2m^2}e^{-i\tan^{-1}\frac{|e|Bs(1-u)}{1+i|e|Bs(1-u)}} + c.t._1 \tag{88}$$

We go, like before, to the variables $u, y = |e|Bsu$ such that $du\,ds = \frac{du\,dy}{|e|Bu}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\delta m^0_{LLL} &= \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty dy \int_0^1 \frac{du}{|e|B\,u\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{y(1-u)}{u+iy(1-u)}\Big]\frac{i|e|Bu}{u+iy(1-u)}\,e^{-iyum^2/|e|B}\,e^{-i\tan^{-1}\frac{y(1-u)}{u+iy(1-u)}} + c.t._1\\ &= \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty dy \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{y(1-u)}{u+iy(1-u)}\Big]\frac{i}{u+iy(1-u)}\,e^{-iyum^2/|e|B}\,e^{-i\tan^{-1}\frac{y(1-u)}{u+iy(1-u)}} + c.t._1\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Next, we go to $t = iy$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\delta m^0_{LLL} &= \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^{+i\infty} dt \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{-it(1-u)}{u+t(1-u)}\Big]\frac{1}{u+t(1-u)}\,e^{-tum^2/|e|B}\,e^{-i\tan^{-1}\frac{-it(1-u)}{u+t(1-u)}} + c.t._1\\ &= \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^{+i\infty} dt \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{-it(1-u)}{u+t(1-u)}\Big]\frac{1}{u+t(1-u)}\,e^{-tum^2/|e|B}\,e^{-i\tan^{-1}\frac{-it(1-u)}{u+t(1-u)}} + c.t._1\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Last, as before, we go to $z = ut \Rightarrow du\,dt = \frac{du\,dz}{u}$.

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} = \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^{i\infty} dz \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cos\tan^{-1}\frac{-iz(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}\Big]\frac{1}{u^2+z(1-u)}\,e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\,e^{-i\tan^{-1}\frac{-iz(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}} + c.t._1 \tag{91}$$

One has

$$\tan^{-1}(-ix) = (-i)\tanh^{-1}x, \quad \cos(-ix) = \cosh x \tag{92}$$

therefore

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} = \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^{i\infty} dz \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cosh\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}\Big]\frac{1}{u^2+z(1-u)}\,e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\,e^{-\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}} + c.t._1 \tag{93}$$

As long as $m \neq 0$, the $e^{-zm^2/|e|B}$ and the $e^{-\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}}$ ensure the convergence on the infinite 1/4 circle such that, supposing that no pole in the 1/4 quadrant causes problems, one may do a Wick rotation, which yields

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} = \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\underbrace{4\int_0^\infty dz \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cosh\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}\Big]\frac{1}{u^2+z(1-u)}\,e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\,e^{-\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}}}_{\hat{I}^0(L),L=|e|B/m^2} + c.t._1 \tag{94}$$

When $m = 0$, $\delta m^0_{LLL} = \frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty dz \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\,\frac{1}{u^2+z(1-u)}\,\frac{1}{2}\left(1+e^{-2\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}}\right) \sim \frac{\alpha m}{2\pi}\int_0^\infty dz \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\,\frac{1}{u^2+z(1-u)}$ which diverges at $z \to \infty$. Like before, one must eventually take the limit $m \to 0$ after the integration has been performed.

The exponential $e^{-2\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}}$ being bounded by 1 and going to 0 when $z\to\infty$, we have to evaluate

$$\delta m^0_{LLL}\sim\frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\underbrace{2\int_0^\infty dz\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\,\frac{e^{-zm^2/|e|B}}{u^2+z(1-u)}\,(1+\epsilon)}_{\hat I^0(L),L=|e|B/m^2}+c.t._1,\quad 0\le\epsilon\le 1, \tag{95}$$

in which we have, like previously, factorized $\frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}$, at the price of introducing an extra factor 2 in front of the integral. One accordingly defines now

$$\begin{aligned}\hat I^0(L)&=4\int_0^\infty dz\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\Big[\cosh\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}\Big]\frac{1}{u^2+z(1-u)}\,e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\,e^{-\tanh^{-1}\frac{z(1-u)}{u^2+z(1-u)}}\\&\simeq 2\int_0^\infty dz\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\,\frac{e^{-zm^2/|e|B}}{u^2+z(1-u)}\,(1+\epsilon),\quad 0\le\epsilon\le 1.\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Note that, unlike when taking all Landau levels of the internal electrons into account, the integral $\hat I_0(L)$ is convergent at $z=0$ without introducing any counterterm.

One has

$$g_0(z)\equiv\int_0^1\frac{du}{\sqrt{1-u}}\,\frac{2}{u^2+z(1-u)}=-\frac{4\sqrt{2}\left(\dfrac{\tan^{-1}\left(\dfrac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{z+\sqrt{(z-4)z}-2}}\right)}{\sqrt{z+\sqrt{(z-4)z}-2}}-\dfrac{\tan^{-1}\left(\dfrac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{z-\sqrt{(z-4)z}-2}}\right)}{\sqrt{z-\sqrt{(z-4)z}-2}}\right)}{\sqrt{(z-4)z}}, \tag{97}$$

(to be compared with (55)) such that

$$\delta m^0_{LLL}\sim\frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\int_0^\infty dz\,e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\,g_0(z)+c.t._1. \tag{98}$$

7.4.1 Contribution of the counterterm to δm^0_{LLL}

For external LLL, $\pi_\perp^2\to|e|B,\sigma^3\to-1$, this counterterm contributes to δm^0_{LLL} by

$$c.t._1=-\lim_{B\to0}\frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^\infty dz\int_0^1\frac{du}{u^2\sqrt{1-u}}\,e^{-z\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\,e^{-z\frac{1-u}{u^2}}, \tag{99}$$

which is convergent. It yields

$$c.t._1=-\lim_{B\to0}\frac{\alpha m}{\pi}\int_0^1\frac{du}{u^2\sqrt{1-u}}\,\frac{1}{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}+\frac{1-u}{u^2}}=-\lim_{B\to0}\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\,\frac{|e|B}{m}\,g_0\left(\frac{|e|B}{m^2}\right), \tag{100}$$

in which g_0 is the same as that defined in (97). At the limit $z\to0$

$$g_0(z)\overset{z\to0}{\sim}\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{z}}+2\ln2-\frac{\ln z}{2}+\frac{z}{16}(-\ln z-1+4\ln2)+\mathcal{O}(z^{3/2}), \tag{101}$$

such that

$$c.t._1=-\lim_{B\to0}\Big(\frac{\alpha}{2}\,\sqrt{|e|B}+\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\,\frac{|e|B}{m}\,\ln2\Big)+\dots \tag{102}$$

which we shall truncate at the first term since the limit $m\to0$ should be taken afterwards. Accordingly, one finds a vanishing counterterm (which is in particular independent of the external B)

$$c.t._1=0. \tag{103}$$

Collecting (98) and (103) yields

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} \sim \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\int_0^\infty dz\, e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\, g_0(z). \tag{104}$$

Notice that the bare δm^0_{LLL} (and, of course, the (vanishing) counterterm) are both finite, unlike when all Landau levels of the internal electron are accounted for.

7.5 The limit of δm^0_{LLL} when $m \to 0$

In addition to the limit $z \to 0$ given in (101) one has

$$g_0(z) \overset{z\to\infty}{\sim} \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{z}} - \frac{4}{z} + \frac{2\pi}{z^{3/2}} - \frac{32}{3z^3} + \dots. \tag{105}$$

So, splitting the z interval of integration of (104) into 3 sub-intervals gives

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} \sim \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\left[\int_0^a dz\, e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{z}} + \underbrace{\int_a^b dz\, e^{-zm^2/|e|B} g_0(z)}_{constant} + \int_b^\infty dz\, e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{z}}\quad\right]. \tag{106}$$

The bounds a and b are chosen such that, for $z \in [0,a]$ the expansion (101) is valid, and for $z \in [b,\infty]$ the expansion (105) is valid. Since

$$\int dz\, \frac{e^{-zm^2/|e|B}}{\sqrt{z}} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\; Erf\left(\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}\sqrt{z}\right)}{\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}}, \tag{107}$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned}\delta m^0_{LLL} \sim \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\Bigg[&\pi\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}}\Big(Erf(\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}\sqrt{a}) - \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}}\times 0\Big)\\ &+ cst\\ &+ 2\pi\,\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}}\Big(\underbrace{Erf(\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}\sqrt{z=\infty})}_{1} - Erf(\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}\sqrt{b})\Big)\quad\Bigg].\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

To study the limit $m \to 0$ we use

$$\begin{aligned} Erf(x) &\overset{x\to 0}{\sim} \frac{2x}{\sqrt{\pi}},\\ Erf(x) &\overset{x\to\infty}{\sim} 1,\end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

which shows that it is the value at $z = \infty$ that controls δm^0_{LLL}.

Finally

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} \overset{m\to 0}{\to} \frac{\alpha}{2}\,\sqrt{\pi\,|e|B} = \sqrt{2}\,\delta m_{LLL}. \tag{110}$$

7.6 An approximate analytical expression for δm^0_{LLL}. Comparison with δm_{LLL}

It is easy to get a fair approximate analytical expression for δm^0_{LLL} given in (104) but using the following simple fit to $g_0(z)$

$$g_0^{app}(z) \simeq e^{-z/30}\Big(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{z}} + 2\ln 2\Big) + e^{-30/z}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{z}} - \frac{4}{z}\Big), \tag{111}$$

which has, in particular, the appropriate limits at $z \to 0$ and $z \to \infty$. On fig. 5 the exact g_0 is plotted in blue and the approximate one in yellow.



Fig. 5: the exact g_0 given in (97 (blue) and its approximate expression (111) (yellow)

This yields

$$\delta m^0_{LLL} \approx \frac{\alpha m}{4\pi}\left(\frac{2\pi^{3/2}\ \exp\Big[-2\sqrt{30}\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\Big]}{\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}} + \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}+\frac{1}{30}}} + \frac{60\ln(2)}{30\,\frac{m^2}{|e|B}+1} - 8\,BesselK\big(0,2\sqrt{30}\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\big)\right), \tag{112}$$

which has the limit (110) when $m \to 0$. Notice also that the second contribution yields a finite $\delta m^0_{LLL} \to \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\,\pi^{3/2}\sqrt{|e|B}$ when $m \to \infty$.

On Fig. 6, we plot $\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\int_0^\infty dz\ e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\ g_0(z)$ in blue together with $\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\int_0^\infty dz\ e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\ g_0^{app}(z)$ in yellow, which corresponds to $4\pi\delta m^0_{LLL}/\alpha\sqrt{|e|B}$. It shows that this rather crude approximation is good at better than 7% for $\frac{m^2}{|e|B} \geq .4$, at $\sim 10\%$ for lower values of $\frac{m^2}{|e|B}$ and that it has, of course, the appropriate limit $2\pi^{3/2} \approx 11.14$ at $\frac{m^2}{|e|B} = 0$.



Fig. 6: $\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\int_0^\infty dz\ e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\ g_0(z)$ in blue and $\sqrt{\frac{m^2}{|e|B}}\int_0^\infty dz\ e^{-zm^2/|e|B}\ g_0^{app}(z)$ in yellow as functions of $\frac{m^2}{|e|B}$.

Fig. 6 also shows that this approximation is the worse in the close vicinity of $\frac{m^2}{|e|B} = 0$. Including higher orders in the expansions of $g_0(z)$ at $z \to 0$ and $z \to \infty$ turns out to improve the situation at large values of $\frac{m^2}{|e|B}$ but, instead, to worsen it close to 0.

On Fig. 7 we plot $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m_{LLL}}{\sqrt{|e|B}}$ given in (56) and (55) in blue together with $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m^0_{LLL}}{\sqrt{|e|B}}$ given in (104) and (97) as functions of $\frac{m^2}{|e|B}$. They determine the behavior of the corresponding δm's at fixed value of $|e|B$ when m becomes larger and larger (and not their limits at $|e|B \to 0$, which vanishes for both in virtue of the first renormalization condition). As we see, this behavior is very different for the two cases: $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m_{LLL}}{\sqrt{|e|B}}$ behaves like $\frac{e^{-m^2/|e|B}}{\sqrt{m^2/|e|B}} \to 0$ when $\frac{m^2}{|e|B} \to \infty$ while $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m^0_{LLL}}{\sqrt{|e|B}}$ goes to $\pi^{3/2}$ at the same limit.



Fig. 7: $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m_{LLL}}{\sqrt{|e|B}}$ *given in (61) (blue) and* $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m^0_{LLL}}{\sqrt{|e|B}}$ *given in (112) (yellow) as functions of* $\frac{m^2}{|e|B}$

On Fig. 8 [12] we now plot $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m_{LLL}}{m}$ (in blue) and $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m^0_{LLL}}{m}$ (in yellow) as functions of $\frac{|e|B}{m^2}$. This shows how the δm's vary with B at fixed m. Once more, while we witness as expected their both vanishing at $B = 0$ according to the 1st renormalization condition, their behavior $\propto \sqrt{|e|B}$ when B becomes larger and larger is factorized by different coefficients; as a result $\delta m^0_{LLL}/m$ is already more than twice $\delta m_{LLL}/m$ at $\frac{|e|B}{m^2} = 20$. Restricting the internal electron to its LLL results accordingly in a very large overestimate of the self-mass.



Fig. 8: $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m_{LLL}}{m}$ *(blue) and* $\frac{4\pi}{\alpha}\frac{\delta m^0_{LLL}}{m}$ *(yellow) as functions of* $\frac{|e|B}{m^2}$

7.7 A few remarks

δm_{LLL} and δm^0_{LLL} do not have the same limits at $m \to 0$, nor at $m \to \infty$.

Would $m \to 0$ be equivalent to $eB \to \infty$, one could, at first sight, expect that only the LLL plays a role. This would however only be true if the only physical variable was $|e|B/m^2$, and if renormalization did not put a grain of salt in such an argumentation.

While it is true that $G^{n=0}(p, B)$ can indeed be obtained by formally taking the limit $B \to \infty$ of $G_0(p, B)$ (see Appendix A), one should notice that:

* this limit cannot be applied to the phase Φ;

* the factor $e^{-k_\perp^2/|e|B}$ is not replaced by 1 inside $G^{n=0}$ despite $B \to \infty$; this is because, as the Larmor radius shrinks to 0 at this limit, $k_\perp$ can extend to ∞;

* the (vanishing) counterterm is determined by taking first the limit $B \to 0$, so as to fulfill renormalization conditions; then, eventually, the non-vanishing limit $m \to 0$ is taken; therefore, naively taking the limit $B \to \infty$ to "select" the LLL cannot be applied either to the counterterm.

[12] Figs. 7 and 8 are not plotted with the approximate analytical expressions that we have deduced for the δm's, but by numerical integration of their exact expressions.

Arguing that the limit $m \to 0$ is equivalent to $B \to \infty$ can accordingly only be wrong [13].

The limits at $m \to \infty$ (which should not be confused with those at $B \to 0$) are also very different since $\delta m_{LLL} \sim \frac{|e|B}{m}\, e^{-m^2/|e|B} \to 0$ while $\delta m^0_{LLL} \sim cst \times \sqrt{|e|B}$ (see Fig. 7).

Large cancellations therefore occur among multiple Landau levels of the virtual electron. However, they can only be estimated after going through the filter of renormalization, and infinities that need being tamed only arise when one accounts for all levels.

8 Conclusion and prospects

Unlike what happens for QED$_{3+1}$, the massless limit of the 1-loop δm_{LLL} in external B for QED$_{3+1}$ reduced on a 2-brane does not vanish. We have shown furthermore that it corresponds to an electron propagating inside a graphene-like medium. The latter cannot therefore stay "gapless" at 1-loop in the presence of a magnetic field. This result has been obtained with special attention paid to the renormalization conditions.

The result is very simple because we have restricted the external electron to lie in the lowest Landau level. For higher levels, the situation is much more intricate and analytical formulæ certainly cannot be obtained.

We have also shown that restricting to the LLL of the internal electron largely overestimates the self-mass; in particular, its value when $m \to 0$ triggers a multiplicative factor $\sqrt{2}$. Despite the case under concern has the peculiarity that taming infinities and renormalizing is only needed when accounting for all Landau levels, studies based on such an approximation appear rather suspicious. Note that, in the case of standard QED$_{3+1}$, it was shown in [18] that accounting for the sole leading $(\ln)^2$ terms largely increases the result, too.

I cannot pretend to have dealt with real graphene, in which, in particular, the smallness of the Fermi velocity with respect to the speed of light makes the theory strongly coupled. There, techniques have to be mastered which go beyond perturbative expansions, while respecting appropriate renormalization conditions.

It is also well known that the photon propagator gets modified in the presence of an external B (see for example [26]). This modification has been included in calculations of the electron self-energy [25] [15] with the result that double logs are turned into single logs. However, the large single logs closely associated with counterterms (see [3]) were not taken into account. Furthermore, this modification of the photon propagator and the eventual screening of the Coulomb potential is obtained by resumming the infinite geometric series of 1-loop vacuum polarizations (see for example [26]); in contrast, Quantum Field Theory stipulates that renormalization conditions and the addition of the corresponding counterterms should be achieved consistently order by order in powers of the coupling constant or in the number of loops. In this framework, screening the Coulomb potential inside the electron self-energy at finite order raises many issues, both technical and conceptual.

Acknowledgments: It is a great pleasure to thank M.I. Vysotsky for his invaluable assistance and advice.

[13] Eventually forcing the identity between the two limits at $m = 0$ of δm_{LLL} and δm^0_{LLL} as a kind of renormalization condition must be rejected.

Appendix

A The propagator $G^{n=0}(p, B)$ of an electron in the lowest Landau level as the limit at $B \to \infty$ of $G_0(p, B)$ (without the phase (2))

After putting aside the phase Φ given in (2), we can get it by taking the limit $B \to \infty$ in $G(p, B)$

Let us consider the general expression (6) of [10] ($z = |e|Bs_1$), which does not include the phase

$$-iG_0(p,B) = \int_0^\infty ds_1 e^{-is_1[m^2 - i\epsilon + p_\parallel^2 + \frac{\tan z}{z} p_\perp^2]} \frac{e^{iq\sigma^3 z}}{\cos z}\Big(m - (\gamma p)_\parallel - \frac{e^{-iq\sigma^3 z}}{\cos z}(\gamma p)_\perp\Big). \tag{113}$$

Since $(q\sigma_3)^2 = 1$, $\cos q\sigma^3 z = \cos z$ and $\sin q\sigma^3 z = q\sigma^3 \sin z$. As $\sigma^3 = i\gamma^1\gamma^2$, if one cancels at the beginning the 2 inverse exponentials one gets

$$-iG_0(p,B) = \int_0^\infty ds_1\, e^{-is_1\big(m^2 - i\epsilon + p_\parallel^2 + \frac{\tan z}{z} p_\perp^2\big)} \Big(\big(1 - q\gamma^1\gamma^2 \frac{\sin z}{\cos z}\big)\big(m - (\gamma p)_\parallel\big) - \frac{(\gamma p)_\perp}{\cos^2 z}\Big). \tag{114}$$

To take the limit $B \to \infty$ one must first make a Wick rotation $s_1 = -iy_1$. Then, $\sin z = -i \sinh |e|By_1, \cos z = \cosh |e|By_1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} -iG_0(p,B) &= -i\int_0^{i\infty} dy_1\, e^{-y_1\big(m^2 - i\epsilon + p_\parallel^2 + \frac{-i\tanh |e|By_1}{-i|e|By_1} p_\perp^2\big)} \Big(\big(1 - q\gamma^1\gamma^2 \frac{-i\sinh |e|By_1}{\cosh |e|By_1}\big)\big(m - (\gamma p)_\parallel\big) - \frac{(\gamma p)_\perp}{\cosh^2 eBy_1}\Big) \\ &= -i\int_0^{i\infty} dy_1\, e^{-y_1\big(m^2 - i\epsilon + p_\parallel^2 + \frac{\tanh |e|By_1}{|e|By_1} p_\perp^2\big)} \Big(\big(1 + iq\gamma^1\gamma^2 \frac{\sinh eBy_1}{\cosh eBy_1}\big)\big(m - (\gamma p)_\parallel\big) - \frac{(\gamma p)_\perp}{\cosh^2 eBy_1}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

Then, $\int_0^{i\infty} + \int_{1/4\ circle} + \int_\infty^0 dy_1 = \sum residues$. If we suppose that $\int_{1/4\ circle} = 0$ and that $\sum residues = 0$, $\int_0^{i\infty} dy_1 = \int_0^\infty dy_1$ and

$$-iG_0(p,B) = -i\int_0^\infty dy_1\, e^{-y_1\big(m^2 - i\epsilon + p_\parallel^2 + \frac{\tanh |e|By_1}{|e|By_1} p_\perp^2\big)} \Big(\big(1 + iq\gamma^1\gamma^2 \frac{\sinh eBy_1}{\cosh eBy_1}\big)\big(m - (\gamma p)_\parallel\big) - \frac{(\gamma p)_\perp}{\cosh^2 eBy_1}\Big), \tag{116}$$

on which we can now take the limit $B \to \infty$.

$$-iG_0(p,B) \overset{B\to\infty}{\to} -ie^{-p_\perp^2/|e|B} \int_0^\infty dy_1\, e^{-y_1(m^2 + p_\parallel^2)} \Big(\big(1 + iq\gamma^1\gamma^2\big)\big(m - (\gamma p)_\parallel\big)\Big). \tag{117}$$

This is the usual result (65) for $G^{n=0}(p, B)$ since $q = -1$.

If we had used instead eq. (2.47b) of [2], in which $e < 0$, we would have got the wrong projector $1 + i\gamma^1\gamma^2$, while, with their conventions, the wave function of the LLL is the same. The exponentials $e^{\pm iz\sigma^3}$ of [2], which should in reality be $e^{\pm iqz\sigma^3}$ with $q = -1$. This is one of the rare examples in QED where the sign of the electric charge matters.

References

[1] J. SCHWINGER: "Particles, sources and fields", Perseus Books, Advanced Book Classics (1998).

[2] W. DITTRICH, M. REUTER: "Effective Lagrangians in Quantum Electrodynamics", Springer-Verlag, Lecture Notes in Physics 220 (1985).

[3] B. MACHET: "The 1-loop self-energy of an electron in a strong external magnetic field revisited", arXiv:1510.03244 [hep-ph], Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 31 (2016) 1650071.

[4] M. DEMEUR: "Étude de l'interaction entre le champ propre d'une particule et un champ electro-magnétique homogène et constant", Acad. Roy. Belg., Classe Sci., Mem. 28, No 1643 (1953-55) 651 C (in french).

[5] B. JANCOVICI: "Radiative Correction to the Ground-State Energy of an Electron in an Intense Magnetic Field", Phys. Rev. 187 (1969) 2275.

[6] M.O. GOERBIG: "Electronic properties of graphene in a strong magnetic field", Rev. Mod. Phys. 83 (2011) 1193.

[7] E.V. GORBAR, V.P. GUSYNIN, V.A. MIRANSKY: "Dynamical chiral symmetry breaking on a brane in reduced QED", Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 105028.

[8] M. Sh. PEVZNER and D.V. KHOLOD: "Static potential of a point charge in reduced QED_{3+1}", Russian Physics Journal, Vol.52, n0 10 (2009) 1077.

[9] J. SCHWINGER: "Quantum Electrodynamics. II. Vacuum Polarization and Self-Energy", Phys. Rev. 75 (1949) 651.

[10] WU-Yang TSAI: "Modified electron propagation function in strong magnetic fields", Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 1342

[11] V.A. MIRANSKY, I.A. SHOVKOVY: "Quantum field theory in a magnetic field; from quantum chromodynamics to graphene and Dirac semimetals", arXiv:1503.00732, Phys. Rept. 576 (2015) 1-209.

[12] Yu.M. LOSKUTOV, B.B. SKOBELEV: "Radiative corrections to the electron mass operator in the two-dimensional approximation of quantum electrodynamics", Teor. Mat. Fiz. 38 (1979) 195-200.

[13] V.P. GUSYNIN, V.A. MIRANSKY & I.A. SHOVKOVY: "Dimensional reduction and catalysis of dynamical symmetry breaking by a magnetic field", hep-ph/9509320, Nucl. Phys. B 462 (1996) 249-290.

[14] Yu.M. LOSKUTOV, B.B. SKOBELEV: "Behavior of the mass operator in a superstrong magnetic field: summation of the perturbation theory diagrams", Teor. Mat. Fiz. 48 (1981) 44-48.

[15] A.V. KUZNETSOV, N.V. MIKHEEV & M.V. OSIPOV: "Electron mass operator in a strong magnetic field", Mod. Phys. Lett. A 17 (2002) 231-235.

[16] V.P. GUSYNIN, V.A. MIRANSKY & I.A. SHOVKOVY: "Dynamical Chiral Symmetry Breaking in QED in a Magnetic Field: Toward Exact Results", hep-th/9811079, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999) 1291.

[17] V.P. GUSYNIN, V.A. MIRANSKY & I.A. SHOVKOVY: "Theory of the magnetic catalysis of chiral symmetry breaking in QED", hep-ph/9908320, Nucl. Phys. B 563 (1999) 361-389.

[18] B. MACHET, . . . ; "The 1-loop vacuum polarization for a graphene-like medium in an external magnetic field", in preparation.

[19] J.M. LUTTINGER: "A Note on the Magnetic Moment of the Electron", Phys. Rev. 74 (1948) 893.

[20] A. KUZNETSOV, N. MIKHEEV: "Electroweak Processes in External Electromagnetic Fields", Springer Tracts in Modern Physics 197 (2004).

[21] V.B. BERESTETSKII, E.M. LIFSHITZ, & L.P. PITAYEVSKII, "Quantum Electrodynamics", Theoretical Physics Vol. IV (Fizmatlit, Moscow, 2001) ["Quantum Electrodynamics", Course of Theoretical Physics Vol. 4, translated from russian by J.B. Sykes and J.S. Bell (Pergamon, New York, 1982)].

[22] M.I. VYSOTSKY: "Atomic levels in superstrong magnetic fields and $D = 2$ QED of massive electrons: screening", Pis'ma v ZhETF 92 (2010) 22-26.

[23] A.V. KUZNETSOV & A.A. OKRUGIN: "The exact electron propagator in a magnetic field as the sum over Landau levels on a basis of the Dirac equation exact solutions", IJMP A 26 (2011) 2725, arXiv:1104.2158 [hep-ph].

[24] A. CHODOS & K. EVERDING, D.A. OWEN: "QED with a chemical potential: The case of a constant magnetic field", Phys. Rev. D 42 (1990) 2881.

[25] Yu.M. LOSKUTOV, B.B. SKOBELEV: "Massovii operator : adnologarifmitcheskaja polevaja asimptotika", Vestn. Mosk. Un-Ta. Ser. 3 Fisica Astronomia, 1983, T. 24 No 6, p. 95 (in russian).

[26] B. MACHET & M.I. VYSOTSKY: "Modification of Coulomb law and energy levels of the hydrogen atom in a superstrong magnetic field", arXiv:1011.1762 [hep-ph], Phys. Rev. D 83 (2011) 025022.